



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MJ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/954,771	10/20/1997	PHILIP W. INGHAM	HMSU-P11-006	6520
28120	7590	01/28/2004	EXAMINER	
ROPES & GRAY LLP ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110-2624			BRANNOCK, MICHAEL T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/954,771	INGHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Brannock	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 123-172 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 123-172 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 November 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Detailed Action

Status of Application: Claims and Amendments

Claims 123-166 and new claims 167-172 are pending.

Applicant is notified that the amendments put forth on 7/16/03 , have been entered in full.

Double Patenting

Claims 123-172 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 11-13 of copending Application No. 08/462386. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: *in vitro* methods of promoting the growth, differentiation and/or survival of neuronal cells by contacting the cells with a sonic hedgehog protein.

Applicant's intention to provide a terminal disclaimer is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 123-172 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as set forth previously, because the specification, while being enabling for methods of promoting growth, differentiation and/or survival of embryonic neuronal cells by administering a polypeptide (sonic hedgehog) of SEQ ID NO: 8, 11, 12, and 13 or an N-terminal autoproteolytic portion thereof (as

described in the specification), does not reasonably provide enablement for administering a polypeptide other than a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 8, 11, 12, and 13, nor for the administration of portions of the polypeptides other than that of the N-terminal autoproteolytic portion, and nor does the specification provide enablement for promoting growth, differentiation and/or survival of neuronal cells other than embryonic cells. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments have been largely addressed previously. Applicant argues that the specification clearly contemplates that hedgehog polypeptides can be used to influence not only the behavior of embryonic cells and tissues but also the behavior of adult cells. This argument has been fully considered but not deemed persuasive. The specification simply provides the speculation that adult cells would respond to hedgehog polypeptides (e.g. page 63, lines 12-32). The specification suggests/speculates that hedgehog polypeptides might be active in a multitude of neurologic systems and cell types (e.g. pages 63-66). In fact, most, if not all, aspects of neurobiology appear to be encompassed by the suggestions put forth in the specification. The highly skilled artisan would thus appreciate that the contemplations of the specification amount to no more than an invitation to begin a research plan to try to find areas of the adult nervous system that could be manipulated with hedgehog polypeptides, and then to try to find useful ways to manipulate such areas. The post-filing date references and Declarations, referred to by Applicant, are examples of the type extensive research and investigation that the specification has invited the artisan to perform. Thus, the skilled artisan would not be able to make and use

the invention as claimed without the benefit of such post-filing date information. The invitation to perform such extensive research is not a substitute for such research.

Applicant provides a multitude of examples wherein one species of sonic hedgehog protein is effective in another species (pg 14), and concludes (pg 15) that hedgehog signaling is tolerant to some variation in the sequence of the hedgehog protein. This argument has been fully considered but not deemed persuasive. First, Applicant is reminded that the claims have been indicated to be enabled for sonic hedgehog from each of the disclosed species (see above). Second, regarding the concept of signaling being tolerant to sequence variation, there is variation between the naturally occurring sonic hedgehog proteins, referred to in Applicant's examples; yet this variation has occurred under the constraint of over 100 million years of selective pressure during the evolution of these species. These differences have arisen through random mutation, and those that did not function have been eliminated. The specification has provided little more than this strategy of evolution to guide the artisan in the construction of mutants that will function as required. The artisan is simply invited to embark on an essentially random trial and error process of experimentation wherein in amino acids are substituted/added/deleted from the parent sequence and then assayed for activity to try to find variants that work. Third, the claims stipulate that the protein be required to have some effect on neuronal cells, and the specification has not provided a rapid assay such that the artisan would expect that screening for variants would be routine. Fourth, the task of assaying the mutants for function is complicated by the fact that the specification has failed to teach exactly what function should be expected in adult tissues. Thus, the extensive experimentation required to make and test the genus of mutants encompassed by the claims is unduly burdensome.

Applicant's arguments regarding the number of inoperable embodiments that are allowed to be in a claim are unpersuasive because the issue is that the specification has failed to teach how to make operable embodiments without undue experimentation.

Applicant argues that because of the suggestions provided in the specification regarding hedgehog proteins and known disorders, the skilled artisan would be motivated to practice the invention. Applicant also asserts that the examiner has based the rejection on the argument that "one of skill in the art would not be motivated to experiment on adult neuronal cells based on Applicant disclosure" see page 16 of Paper 45. However, the examiner can find no mention of such an argument. To the contrary, it is agreed that the skilled artisan would be motivated to look for effects of hedgehog proteins in the adult, as is evidenced by the tremendous volume of post-filing date research on the subject. However, the issue is that an invitation to perform this research is not a substitute for the facts that come from such research, e.g. what cell types are amenable to manipulation, which are not, and how, in particular, can an individual cell-type be manipulated. While it may be routine in the art of scientific investigation to begin to answer these types of questions, an invitation to begin the quest, does not provide enablement.

Applicant's arguments regarding the expression of patched have been substantially addressed previously. As set forth previously, the specification discloses experiments that indicate sonic hedgehog is not expressed in adult tissues (see page 110, lines 10-11). One of skill in the art would therefore expect that adult tissues would not be responsive to sonic hedgehog in the same way that embryonic tissues are, or perhaps not responsive at all. The specification has provided no guidance as to the nature of the response of adult tissues to sonic hedgehog. Additionally, Applicant admits that the specification does not provide any information

about patched expression in the adult either. Applicant, provides a pre-filing date reference (Takabatake et al., FEBS Letts 410(485-489)1997) that indicates that Shh and patched are expressed in adult neural ocular tissues and other adult tissues. Takabatake et al., merely speculate that “judging from their roles in embryos, hh molecules might function in certain cell-cell communications between deferent types of tissues in the adult eye” (see col 1 of page 489).

Applicant argues that the concept of using embryonically derived proteins as, *inter alia*, trophic factors in adult tissues is well established in the art, and that at the time of filing, one of skill in the art would appreciate that signaling molecules that are expressed in embryonic tissues are also used in the adult. This argument has been fully considered but not deemed persuasive. The particular neurotrophin family members that are the subject of Applicant’s cited references are completely unrelated, structurally and functionally, to hedgehog proteins. Further, neurotrophins are known to be important both during development and in the adult as trophic factors for neurons - as is well established in the art. Additionally, the state of the art of hedgehog signaling in adult tissues, at the time of filing, was extraordinarily primitive compared to that of the neurotrophins. Trifftort et al., Journal of Neurochemistry 70(1327-1330)1998, describe the state of the art as follows: “The roles of HH signaling in adult vertebrates have been poorly documented so far, particularly in the brain where Ptc and Smo transcripts have been identified”, see the last paragraph of col 1 of page 1327. Thus, even if it is agreed that the artisan would be motivated to look for effects of hedgehog proteins in the adult nervous system, the artisan would be required to perform extensive research and investigation to determine what cell types were amenable to manipulation with sonic hedgehog. Further, Miao et al., J. Neuroscience, 17(15)5891-5899, 1997 state that “there is no direct correlation between the

Art Unit: 1646

neuron phenotypes induced by Shh and those supported by Shh in a trophic manner", see col 1 of page 5898. Thus, the particular teachings in the specification regarding embryonic expression of hedgehog and manipulation of embryonic tissues could not be expected to provide the artisan with the knowledge required to manipulate adult tissues.

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brannock, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, Ph.D., can be reached at (571) 272-0871.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

MB



January 19, 2004



YVONNE EYLER, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600